



October 15, 2001

Ms. Susan C. Rocha
Attorney the San Antonio Water System
Denton, Navarro & Bernal
1700 Tower Life Building
310 South St. Mary's Street
San Antonio, Texas 75205-3111

OR2001-4648

Dear Ms. Rocha:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 153388.

The San Antonio Water System ("SAWS") received a request for "any and all disciplinary action taken against any and all SAWS employees and representatives related to SAWS audit of missing computer equipment." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered the comments submitted by the requestor and by two former SAWS employees.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing for submission of public comments).

Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government

¹ Although one of the former SAWS employees argues that SAWS is not a governmental body and that SAWS employees are not public employees, SAWS makes no such argument. As SAWS has sought a determination from this office with respect to this request, we will address whether the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under the Public Information Act.

Code.² See *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). For information to be protected from public disclosure by the common law right of privacy under section 552.101, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation*. In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. 540 S.W.2d at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* includes information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683.

The submitted information consists of a letter of reprimand and two letters of termination. This information is not the type of information that is generally considered highly intimate or embarrassing under the test in *Industrial Foundation*. See *id.* Moreover, this office has found that the following types of information are not excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: educational background and training, Open Records Decision Nos. 455 (1987), 444 (1986); past work history, Open Records Decision Nos. 455 (1987), 444 (1986); names, addresses, and telephone numbers of job references and their comments, Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987); performance evaluations, Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987), 400 (1983); and reasons for a public employee's demotion, dismissal, or resignation, Open Records Decision Nos. 444 (1986), 329 (1982), 278 (1981). Accordingly, we conclude that the submitted information is not confidential under sections 552.101 or 552.102. SAWS must therefore release the requested information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

² Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dept. of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Karen A. Eckerle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAE/sdk

Ref: ID# 153388

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Brian Collister
Reporter
KMOL-TV
P.O. Box 2641
San Antonio, Texas 78299-2641
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David L. Hartman
826 Twin Oaks Dr.
New Braunsfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregg Flowers
1814 Moreshead
San Antonio, Texas 78231
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ralph E. Huber
2258 Estate View
San Antonio, Texas 78260
(w/o enclosures)